REMARKS

In the office communication of 12/13/06, the Examiner objected to claims 47, 51, 53, 58-62, and 64 , stating that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all intervening claims. These claims have been amended as per the Examiner's recommendation, and should now be allowable. In addition, claim 52 was erroneously stated by the Examiner to be dependent on claim 45, while it in actuality is dependent on claim 47, to which the Examiner merely objected, and thus, claim 52 should now also be allowable.

Independent claims 45, 65 and 66 are currently amended, to make clear that the selection of step (b) must be for the operation of step (c), and also making clear that the operation must process all components of the selected text, thus ruling out trivial operations that involve only portions of the text. These amendments clearly overcome the Examiner's prior art citation of Brotzman, in which the selection step is independent of the cited operation (according to the Examiner, display of text associated with an outline element met the original claim limitation of selection of that text; O.A. page 4, first full paragraph), and the operation does not process all components of the selected text (the cited operation is clicking up to table of contents or forward to CD Rom contents, which clearly does not involve any processing of most of the displayed text).

Claims 46, 48-50, and 63 (which is dependent on claim 50) are all dependent on claim 45, and all are now allowable because claim 45 is.

Claim 54 is the method of claim 45, wherein the operation of step (c) comprises storing a copy of said selected text in a computer memory buffer. The

Examiner asserts that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Brotzman to include storing a copy of said selected text in a computer memory buffer because it was well known in document processing to copy a selected text and to store the copied text in memory buffer to paste to another document or a blank file (O.A., top of page 7). However, Brotzman does not select for the operation of step (c), as is now required by the amended step (b) of the invention. Further, the Examiner's example provides no means to specify that the copied text corresponds to that referred to by an indicated outline element, and thus, the Examiner's proposed modification does not result in the claimed invention.

Claim 55 is the method of claim 45, wherein the operation of step (c) comprises searching within said selected text. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brotzman in further view of Shaw. While Shaw discloses searching within selected text (using a Find Next command), Brotzman does not disclose selecting text for an operation of step (c) such as searching, as is required by step (b). Further, the Examiner's example provides no means to specify that the searched text is limited to or corresponds to that referred to by an indicated outline element, and thus, the Examiner's proposed modification does not result in the claimed invention.

Claim 56 is the method of claim 45, wherein the operation of step (c) comprises printing of said selected text. Claim 57 is the method of claim 45, wherein the operation of step (c) comprises copying of said selected text into an electronic clipboard. Claims 56 and 57 are rejected (O.A. page 7) based on the

reasoning that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

"have modified Brotzman to include printing and copying features the text

referred to by the outline element since it was well known that a portion of text

can be printing or copying by highlighting said selected portion to print or to copy

as desired (sic). So in Brotzman, the Preface portion in the text referred to by the

outline element "Preface" in the Table of Contents can be highlighted for printing

or copying." However, Brotzman does not disclose selecting text for an operation

of step (c) such as copying or printing, as is required by step (b). Further, the

Examiner's example provides no means to specify that the copied or printed text

is limited to or corresponds to that referred to by an indicated outline element,

and thus, the Examiner's proposed modification does not result in the claimed

invention.

CONCLUSION

Claims 47, 51-53, 58-62, and 64 are allowable based on amendment that

satisfies the Examiner's objections. The remaining claims are now allowable

based on amendment. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all

claims.

Very Respectfully,

/Philip R. Krause/

Philip R. Krause

Applicant Pro Se

9437 Seven Locks Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
(301)-365-8555
fax: (301)-365-8555